



FINAL MEETING MINUTES

| | |
|---|--|
| SUBJECT: Community Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting #3 | |
| PROJECT: Illinois Route 83/IL137 in Lake County | PROJECT NO.: P-91-159-10 |
| MEETING DATE: Nov. 7, 2012 | MEETING LOCATION: Libertyville Village Hall |
| NOTES BY: B. Jacquot, M. Walton, K. Hall | |

| NAME | ORGANIZATION |
|---|--|
| Aikus, Al | Prince of Peace School |
| Burns, William (replacing Bonnie Brown) | Prince of Peace School |
| Cornew, Barb | Active Transportation Alliance |
| Gramhofer, Gary | Round Lake Beach Public Works |
| Grinnell, Keith | District 46 |
| Herman, Doug | Bicycle Club of Lake County |
| Hovorka, Bob | Grayslake Shell |
| Johnson, Ted | College of Lake County |
| Kimmel, Andy | Lake County Forest Preserve |
| McCollum, Glenn | Village of Lake Villa |
| Rowe, Heather | Village of Libertyville |
| Schuler, James | Liberty Prairie Area Homeowner's Association |
| PROJECT STUDY TEAM | |
| Baker, Osman | IDOT |
| Brozek, Luke | IDOT |
| Feliciano, Jessica | IDOT |
| Hall, Kevin | Planning Communities, LLC |
| Jacquot, Bridgett | Volkert, Inc. |
| Kutryn, Anna | IDOT |
| Schilke, Steve | IDOT |
| Walton, Michael | Volkert, Inc. |

Purpose: The purpose of the meeting was to:

- Present Draft Concepts of the Purpose and Need Statement
- Review Alternative Development Process
- Introduce Engineering Toolbox
- Conduct Alternatives Development Workshop



Agenda:

- Welcome/Opening Remarks
- CAG Meeting #1 and #2 Overview
- Draft Purpose & Need Statement
- Alternatives Development Process
- Engineering Toolboxes
- Break
- Alternatives Development Workshop
- Questions/Closing Remarks

Minutes:

Please view the attached meeting presentation slides that correspond with the following meeting minutes:

Bridgett Jacquot (Volkert) presented slides #1-14.

Slide 1: Welcome

Slide 2: Introductions

Slide 3: Binder

The following handouts were provided for CAG members to put in their binders:

- Presentation
- Agenda
- Meeting minutes from CAG Meeting #2
- Engineering Toolbox Explanation
- Roadway Toolbox
- Bicycle & Pedestrian Toolbox

Slide 4: Meeting Purpose:

The meeting purpose is listed above.

Slide 5: Study Overview

The project study corridor is along Illinois Route 83/IL 137 in Lake County from IL 132 to just east of U.S. 45.

Slide 6: CAG Meeting #1 Overview

During the first CAG meeting, the CAG identified the following key issues/concerns associated with the Illinois Route 83/137 project study area: multimodal transportation (pedestrian/bicycle paths), safety, aesthetics, access, mobility, environmental impacts, schools, and economic impact.

Slide 7: Project Problem Statement

Based on the concerns and issues identified by the CAG, the following problem statement was developed: "The environment surrounding IL 83 and IL 137 from IL 132 to U.S. 45 in Lake County is encompassed by homes, numerous schools, businesses, parks and open lands that have shaped the surrounding communities character and values. The restricted flow of traffic and lack of connectivity to these important resources creates an impediment to mobility and access for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists. It is essential that the IL 83/IL 137 project preserve these community characteristics while improving the overall safety, identifying multi-modal opportunities, and reducing congestion."

**Slide 8: What goes into a Purpose and Need Statement?**

Many different factors go into shaping a statement of Purpose and Need for a project but the outcome should clearly demonstrate that a “need” exists and the discussion should clearly describe the problems which the proposed action is to correct. The Purpose and Need combines technical factors and the issues and concerns specified in the problem statement and the goals identified by the CAG. Technical factors can include: existing and projected traffic volumes, level of service/capacity, crashes, and lack of intermodal relationships.

Slide 9: Purpose and Need Statement

Which leads to the overall needs of the Illinois Route 83/137 project which are to: improve safety, address traffic congestion, and increase multimodal opportunities. Currently, the draft Purpose and Need Statement is going through the review process. At the next CAG meeting, we will discuss the approved Purpose and Need Statement in detail and also present the Statement at the next public meeting.

Slide 10: Alternative Development Process

With the needs of the project identified, we can begin the Alternative Development Process for the Illinois Route 83/137 project, which is the main reason for today's meeting. The alternative development process includes multi-step evaluation process. The alternative development process begins with the development of the initial alternatives concepts, which you all will be helping us develop today. The initial alternative concepts are what you envision the roadway type (number of lanes, median, etc.) to be and also where pedestrian improvements need to be incorporated along the project route. The project team will then develop the initial alternatives from these concepts and screen for fatal flaws and against the Purpose & Need. The Fatal Flaw Screening evaluates each alternative to determine if a characteristic or part of the alternative would render it infeasible, unable to be constructed, or economically unattainable. The Purpose and Need Screening evaluates how well the alternatives meet the project's defined Purpose and Need; does the alternative improve safety, decrease congestion, and improve multimodal opportunities? After these screenings, a number of alternatives will be eliminated and a number will remain. Those that remain are called reasonable alternatives. The reasonable alternatives will then be evaluated based on a general impact evaluation; which is the process that allows us to compare the alternatives to each other based on their impacts to the community, the environment, and property in addition to assessing how well these alternatives meet the goals of the project, which you all have established. This step provides us with an opportunity to identify what alternatives are the most beneficial with the least amount of impacts. This step leads us to the alternatives to be carried forward, which will be evaluated in greater detail. The alternatives and their associated impacts will be provided to the CAG and the public for input on a preferred alternative.

Slide 11: Detailed Impact Evaluation

This table shows an example of evaluation criteria for a project and the how the criteria is measured. This information is vital to alternative decision-making process. The bottom line is it is the responsibility of the project team to find a balance between all these factors. *Ms. Cornew asked if this*

| EXAMPLE Evaluation Criteria | Unit of Measure | Alternatives | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|---|
| | | 1 | 2 |
| Wetlands | Acres | | |
| Threatened & Endangered Species | Number | | |
| Streams Crossings | Number | | |
| Floodplain Encroachments | Linear Feet | | |
| Parks Impacted | Number | | |
| Special Waste Sites | Number | | |
| Relocations (Business) | Number | | |
| Relocations (Residential) | Number | | |
| Total Length | Lane Miles | | |
| Total Area Converted to ROW | Acres | | |
| Preliminary Costs | Million \$ | | |



project would be using a Health Evaluation as a criteria for this project. Ms. Jacquot stated that at this point in time it is not a criteria but may be considered.

Slide 12: National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

So why is IDOT doing all of this? Because assessing the environmental impacts of potential alternatives is a critical component to the overall alternative development process for many reasons but mainly because: IDOT is required to assess environmental impacts for federally funded projects by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA); the purpose of the NEPA is to ensure that environmental factors are weighted equally when compared to other factors in the decision making process; and not only is IDOT responsible for adhering to NEPA, but also to environmental specific regulations, such as, the Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, etc.

Slide 13: NEPA (continued) So how does IDOT accomplish this?

- Prepare an environmental inventory
- Avoid sensitive resources, if possible
- Minimize the impacts to resources if they cannot be avoided
- Mitigate the impacted resource as necessary
- Accomplishes CAG goal of protecting the environment

Slide 14: CAG Meeting #2 Overview

Now that we have explained the process, our next step is to incorporate your goals, identified during our last CAG meeting, into the development of alternatives. The reason why the goals exercise was so important is that it provided a framework and vision for the desired project outcome. The most prominent goals you all identified for the project were:

- Provide safe connections and easy access between all modes of transportation
- Increase students walking and biking to schools
- Decrease traffic congestion
- Integrate Village Comprehensive Land Use Plans
- Provide and preserve community aesthetics
- Protect natural resources

Michael Walton (Volkert) presented slides #15-27.

Slide 15: Engineering Toolbox (Roadway and Pedestrian Tools)

The project team has developed what is called an Engineering Toolbox, which consists of Roadway Toolbox and the Bicycle & Pedestrian Toolbox. This is way for us to show you what design elements can be applied to the roadway to address your goals.

An Engineering Toolbox is:

- A collection of design “tools”
- Used to improve safety and mobility along the highway system.
- These tools are intended as a starting point for the discussion of improvements to the Illinois Route 83/137 roadway.
- The appropriate application of a specific tool does depend upon location conditions.
- Information from the traffic and crash analysis can be used to determine if the amount of traffic, i.e. volume and turn movements, or the types of crashes occurring make the application of a specific tool more or less appropriate.



Slide 16: Engineering Toolbox (Roadway and Pedestrian Tools)

The broad range of tools available will contribute to solutions that are safe for pedestrians (especially school children) and motorists, preserve the character of the community, and are cost effective. These tools will play a role throughout the alternative development and evaluation:

- The application of a specific tool will be dependent upon the local conditions.
- The tool application must meet the needs of a project.
- The impacts of a tool will also be taken into consideration.

Slide 17-23: Engineering Toolbox (Pedestrian Tools)

Next, the CAG members were asked to follow along in the handouts that were provided. Mr. Walton went through each of the following tools and provided an explanation, if necessary. Starting with the Bicycle & Pedestrian Toolbox:

Pedestrian crossing tools:

- High visibility crosswalks
 - Ms. Cornew asked about the possibility of raised crosswalks. Mr. Walton stated raised crosswalks are usually along routes with low traffic volumes.
- Pedestrian countdown signals
 - Mr. Hovorka inquired if these signals could include an auditory feature. Mr. Walton stated that they could.
- Pedestrian pushbutton treatments
- High intensity activated crosswalk
- Grade-separated crossing
- In-roadway warning lights at crosswalks
 - Ms. Rowe asked if there was an example of the use of these lights within Lake County. Mr. Walton stated that he is not aware of any in Lake County but will research to find an example.
- Passive pedestrian sensor
 - Mr. Aikus asked the project team for an example of where a passive pedestrian sensor is used in Lake County. His interest would be to potentially use in front of the Prince of Peace school. Mr. Schilke (IDOT) stated that he was unaware of any area that utilized this sensor but the project team would look into.
- Pedestrian refuge/Pork chop island
 - Mr. Herman stated that unless there is break in the island, bicyclists consider these islands unsafe. Mr. Schilke stated because of ADA requirements, all islands associated with a crossing now have breaks that are at-grade.

School route improvements:

- Sidewalks and walkways
 - A question regarding utilities was asked Mr. McCollum and how the utility relocation along the project route would be addressed. Mr. Schilke stated that this would be addressed in the Phase II design phase and that it would be the responsibility of the municipalities to relocate the utilities, including the cost.
 - A question regarding funding of the sidewalks/bike paths was asked. Mr. Schilke explained that current IDOT policy is to fund 80 percent of the cost and the local municipality would fund 20 percent.

Bicycle improvements:

- Bicycle paths/shared use paths



- A question regarding if this project would include a bicycle count that would identify the bicycle usage within the project study area. Mr. Schilke said that since there are such limited bicycle paths within the project study area, this may not be beneficial for the project. Mr. Kimmel of the Lake County Forest Preserve did state that they keep a count of those using the trails through the Rollins Savanna Forest Preserve but this is not broke out into those walking and those biking.

Signage:

- Signs to prompt motorists
- Double-sided pedestrian crossing signs
- Signs to prompt pedestrian

ADA Improvements:

- Detectable warning tiles
- Wheelchair ramps
- Accessible pedestrian signals

Roadway treatments:

- Driveway improvements
- Reduced crossing widths

Beyond the roadway:

- Eliminate screening
 - Mr. Burns stated that the wetland that resides adjacent to Prince of Peace school provides and unwanted screen turning into and out of the school. The project team stated that these are the kind of issues we need to be made aware of in order to address with the improvements of the Illinois Route 83/137 roadway.
- Transit stop treatments
- Bollards and protective barriers

Traffic control:

- Turn restrictions

A discussion took place regarding school zones. The CAG members from Prince of Peace school inquired why there is not a "school zone" along Illinois Route 83 in front of the school. Mr. Schilke explained that if there is a crossing at the nearby signalized intersection, then a school zone (which would require a reduction in speed), is not required. Since there is a crossing at the intersection of Illinois Route 132 and Illinois Route 83 just north of Prince of Peace school, there is no school zone warranted in this area. There is one school zone along the project route and that is in-between Ziegler Road and Library Lane. Mr. Schilke stated that this is because there is no crossing at Ziegler Road.

Slides 24-25: Engineering Toolbox (Roadway Tools)

Next, the CAG members were asked to follow along with the Roadway Toolbox handout:

Roadway safety improvements:

- Raised median
 - A discussion took place about placing trees in the median. Mr. Schilke stated this could be done but there are some restrictions. The question was also asked if trees could be planted along the roadway. Mr. Schilke stated this could be done but the trees must be planted outside of the clear zone. If there a sidewalk, trees can be planted inbetween the road and the sidewalk but the trees must be at least six feet away from the edge of the shoulder.
- Two-way left-turn lane
- Driveway improvements



- Access management
- Improved sight distance
- Horizontal curve realignment

Intersection safety improvements:

- Left-turn lanes
- Traffic signals
 - A discussion took place as to whether or not the intersection lights along the project route are part of the County's PASSAGE system, which is a way for the County to view their intersections in at any point in time and modify the signals to allow a better flow of traffic. The project team was not sure if any of the signals along the Illinois Route 83/137 route were a part of this system. It was discussed that if they are not, IDOT could possibly work with the County to make the signal lights along this route part of the PASSAGE system.
- Traffic signal modernization
- Roundabout
- Roadway lighting

Slide 26: Engineering Toolbox (Roadway Tools)

Roundabouts were discussed with the CAG. **Roundabouts:** A type of circular intersection in which road traffic is slowed and flows almost continuously in one direction around a central island to several exits onto the various intersecting roads.

ADVANTAGES

- Continuous flow of traffic
- Reduces accident rates and severity
- Reduces vehicle delay
- No equipment maintenance or electricity costs
- Provides a pedestrian crossing opportunity.
- Speed reduction

DISADVANTAGES

- Requires a large amount of right-of-way
- Some drivers may not understand how to proceed through a roundabout
- If a roundabout is placed in close proximity to a signalized intersection where queues may spill back into the roundabout.

A discussion took place with the CAG members regarding roundabouts. The issues/concerns the members had with roundabouts were: if the roundabout median is constructed too high, there is a loss of line of sight; drivers may be unfamiliar with how to proceed through the roundabout; would like to see native prairie grasses planted within the roundabout and maintained properly.

Mr. Schilke stated that there is no specific height to which the roundabout must be built. The planting of native grasses would achieve two CAG goals of providing and preserving community aesthetics and also protecting natural resources because the grasses would aid as a filter to improve water quality. The CAG did not seem too comfortable with the idea of roundabouts along the Illinois Route 83/137 route but some members did agree that if they are placed in the correct location, they work great.

Slide 27: Break

Kevin Hall (Planning Communities) was the facilitator for the CAG Group Exercise, which was covered by Slides #26-40



Slide 28-40: Alternatives Development Workshop

The next part of the meeting consisted of the CAG members participating in an Alternatives Development Workshop. Mr. Hall explained the following about the workshop.

- What will be accomplished during this workshop? The CAG members will:
 - Identify key community sites
 - Identify pedestrian improvement areas
 - Identify roadway alternative concepts
- What will the Project Team do with this information?
 - Develop initial alternatives
 - Run through the alternative development process
- The members will be divided into 3 groups based on interest area/representation:
 - **Northern:** Lake Villa and Round Lake Beach
 - **Central:** Grayslake
 - **Southern:** Libertyville
- You will be provided with:
 - Aerial maps
 - Typical Section Options Sheets
 - Stickers (pedestrian improvements and typical sections)
 - Post-it Notes/Comment Sheets
- Mr. Hall explained that they will have four options to choose from to identify pedestrian improvement areas along the route: school crossing, pedestrian, bicycle, and multi-use.
- Next it was explained that they will be provided the following four typical section options to use for the roadway. The CAG members will be discussing and identifying where and which option they feel fits best along the roadway. There is no right or wrong answer and members can choose different options but recommend discussing with those in your group before making a recommendation.
 - Option A: 2-lane with raised median
 - Option B: 3-lane (2-lane with center turn lane)
 - Option C: 4-lane with raised median
 - Option D: 5-lane (4-lane with center turn lanes)
 - *All typical sections include a 5' sidewalk and a 10' multiuse path*
- Steps to take during the workshop:
 - First, discuss pedestrian improvements.
 - Place stickers on the map where you have identified as an area that needs a pedestrian improvement.
 - Second, discuss the typical sections options (roadway type) where you feel a particular option would work.
 - Place stickers on the map where you have identified what you feel is an appropriate typical section (roadway type).
 - *You may indicate a specific "tool" from the roadway or bicycle/pedestrian toolbox, but this is not necessary.*
 - *Principal goal is identifying the typical section and areas that need pedestrian improvements.*
- You will work for 45 minute in your core area and then rotate to the other two sections for 20 minutes each. Then you will return to core group and report out.
- Remember to ask yourself if the improvements you recommend are addressing the needs of the project which are to: improve the safety of the roadway, address traffic congestion, and increase multimodal opportunities and remember there is a No-Build Alternative.



The CAG exercise began and members went to the area they were most interested in. Members of the project team were stationed at the tables to answer any questions and help the CAG members through the exercise. Members discussed potential pedestrian and roadway improvements for locations along the route and placed the corresponding stickers on the aerial maps. Members spent about 45 to an hour in their core area and then moved on to the other areas if they wished. The exercise resulted in numerous pedestrian improvement and typical section concepts along the entire route. *Please see the end of this document for the results of this exercise.*

Slide 41: Next Steps

The project team will begin developing the initial alternatives from the concepts provided by the CAG today. These alternatives will then be run through the alternatives development process: fatal flaw screen, purpose and need screen, identify reasonable alternatives, and then the general impact evaluation.

Slide 42: Next CAG Meeting

- It is anticipated that our next CAG meeting will be in the Spring of 2013. During this meeting, we will: Review of approved Purpose & Need Statement
- Review of Initial Alternatives
- Presentation of Alternative Development Process Results
- Workshop: Alternatives to Be Carried Forward

Slide 43: Thanks/Questions

A question was asked about the traffic that will be generated by the IL 53/IL 120 Tollway. The project team explained that the Chicago Metropolitan Agency on Planning (CMAP) had provided IDOT with the projected traffic numbers for the year 2040 and the traffic along Illinois Route 137 will actually stay about the same as it is today (approximately 14,000 to 15,000 vehicles per day). The project team did contact CMAP and asked if they had considered the planned growth within the area and CMAP stated that their model did include this when projecting the traffic.



ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP RESULTS

CAG Recommended Typical Sections

Existing Conditions, CAG Suggestions

IL 132 to Burnett - Existing 5 lane (4 lane with NB left turn lane)

Burnett to Prince of Peace - Existing 5 lane transitions to two lane
3 lane, 4 lane or 5 lane

Prince of Peace to north of Engle - Existing 2 lane transitions to 5 lane
5 lane (4 lane with center turn lane)

North of Engle to south of Monaville - Existing 5 lane (4 lane with center turn lane/striped median)
5 lane (4 lane with center turn lane)

South of Monaville to North of Hook - Existing 2 lane with center turn lane/striped median
5 lane (4 lane with center turn lane)

North of Hook to south of Rollins - Existing 2 lane to be improved in upcoming project
Existing 5 lane (4 lane with center turn lane)

South of Rollins to Lexington - Existing 2 lane transitions to 2 lane with striped median
4 lane with raised median

Lexington to north of Washington – Existing 2 lane
5 lane (4 lane with center turn lane)

North of Washington to south of Washington – Existing 4 lane with turn lane
Existing 5 lane (4 lane with center turn lane)

South of Washington to south of Center – Existing 2 lane
3 lane (2 lane with turn lane)

South of Center to IL 120 – Existing 2 lane
4 lane with raised median

IL 120 to Atkinson/IL 83 – Existing 4 lane transitions to 2 lane
Proposed improvement 5 lane (4 lane with center turn lane)

Atkinson/IL 83 to east of US 45 – Existing 2 lane transitions to 2 lane with center turn lane
5 lane (4 lane with center turn lane)

CAG Recommended Bike and Pedestrian Improvements

Existing Conditions, CAG Suggestions



IL 132 to Burnett (newly constructed section)

(New sidewalk both sides)

Nothing suggested

Burnett to Prince of Peace

(New sidewalk east, nothing west)

Nothing suggested

Prince of Peace to Park

(Existing sidewalk east side from Bretons to Park, nothing on west)

Sidewalk east, nothing west

@ Park

Bike path along Park Ave (west side of IL 83)

Park to Engle

(Nothing existing)

Sidewalk east, Multi-Use west

Engle to Monaville

Sidewalk east, Multi-Use west

(Existing sidewalk west)

@ Monaville Rd

Multi-Use transition from east to west (north side of Monaville intersection)

Monaville to Lexington Dr

(Nothing existing)

Multi-Use east, Sidewalk west

@ Lexington Dr / E Fox Chase

(Existing sidewalk both sides of Lexington and both sides of E Fox Chase Dr)

Lexington Dr to Millstone

Multi-Use east, nothing west

(Nothing existing)

Millstone to North of Hook

Multi-Use east, Sidewalk west

(Existing sidewalk/Multi-Use east)

(Existing sidewalk west)

New improvement from North of Hook to South of Rollins

(New Multi-Use east, Sidewalk west)

South of Rollins to Brighton

Multi-Use east, Sidewalk west

@ Brighton

Sidewalk south side on Brighton Ln

Brighton to Shorewood



Multi-Use east, nothing west

(Nothing existing)

@ Shorewood

School Crossing

(Existing sidewalk along south side of Shorewood Rd west of IL 83)

(Existing sidewalk along north side of Shorewood Rd east of IL 83)

Shorewood to Lake

Multi-Use west, nothing east

(Nothing existing)

@ Lexington Ln

"Crossing Safe"

@ Lake

(Existing Multi-Use along south side of Lake St (east side of IL 83))

Lake to North of Washington

Nothing east, Multi-Use west

(Nothing east)

(Existing Multi-Use west)

North of Washington to Washington

Nothing proposed

(Nothing existing)

@ Washington

"Does this path connect from Washington St. north to yellow path?"

(Existing Multi-Use along north side of Washington St crossing IL 83)

Washington to Highland

Multi-Use east, nothing west

(Nothing existing)

@ Highland

School Crossing

Highland to Frederick

Multi-Use east, Sidewalk west

(Nothing existing)

@ Frederick

School Crossing (Signal Timing)

Frederick to Ziegler

Sidewalk east, Sidewalk west

(Existing sidewalk east)

(Nothing west)

@ Ziegler

Potential School Crossing (May not be needed – should only cross at signalized intersections)

(Existing school crossing)

Ziegler to Library



Sidewalk east, Sidewalk west
(Existing sidewalk both sides)

@ Library

(Existing school crossing)

School Crossing (Signal Timing)

Library to Center

Sidewalk east, nothing west

(Nothing existing)

@ Center

School Crossing

(Existing Multi-Use along north side of Center St crossing IL 83)

Center to IL 120

Multi-Use east, nothing west

(Nothing existing)

@ IL 120

Multi-Use along north side of IL 120 (east side of IL 83)

IL 120 to Atkinson

(Nothing existing)

Nothing proposed

@Atkinson

Multi-Use along north side of Atkinson Rd (This Multi-Use path was not included along Atkinson Rd in upcoming improvement)

Atkinson to Casey

Multi-Use east, nothing west

(Existing bike path through Savanna east of roadway. Nothing existing along the route)

@ Casey

Connect Multi-Use from IL 83 to existing Multi-Use on north side of Casey Rd (each direction)

(Existing Multi-Use along north side of Casey Rd crossing IL 137)

Casey to North of Peterson

Multi-Use east, nothing west

(Nothing existing)

North of Peterson

Connect Multi-Use to Old IL 137 North of Peterson

(Nothing existing)

CAG Miscellaneous Items

Park Ave

Place signal at intersection

Lexington Dr / E Fox Chase Dr

Check signal warrants



Lexington Ln

Add Right Turn Lane with Merge Lane?

South of Lake St

“One concern about vehicle speeds and conflict”

Sheet 13

Show IL 153/120 ROW

Potential Double/Triple Track (N Central)

Casey Rd

“Intersection undersized”

Bull Creek Dr

Fatality at Bull Creek – Dangerous to pull out – Turning left dangerous, also backs up traffic IL 83

“Bull Creek Drainage”

Peterson Rd

Check RR planning (Andy)

Peterson to IL 137 EB ramp

Consider future growth Libertyville

IL 137 WB to Peterson

Merge is too short - Needs clearer signage markings

Butterfield Rd

IL 137 WB – Need a right turn lane onto Butterfield – Bike lanes on shoulder - Bicycle to the south to connect the Regional Trail

IL 137 EB - Right turn onto Butterfield creates dangerous situation at intersection just south